



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,092	05/10/2007	Paul Oreste Gioia	60838.000610	4356
21967 7590 10/31/2008 HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109			EXAMINER SOROUSH, ALI	
			ART UNIT 1616	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/31/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/588,092

Applicant(s)

GIOIA, PAUL ORESTE

Examiner

ALI SOROUSH

Art Unit

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 16 and 18-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 16 and 18-30 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/23/2008
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement of Receipt

Applicant's response filed on 07/24/2008 to the Office Action mailed 01/24/2008 is acknowledged.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-14 and 17 are cancelled and claims 15, 18, 23, 27, 28 and 30 are currently amended. Therefore, claims 15, 16, and 18-30 are currently pending examination for patentability.

Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from the previous Office Action are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set of rejections and/or objections presently being applied to the instant application.

2. The rejection of claims 15, 16, and 18-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aven (European Patent Application EP 1025757 A1, Published 08/09/2000) in view of Hei et al. (US Patent 6593283 B2, Published 07/15/2003) as evidenced by Sealed Air (MSDS Instapak Port Cleaner, Rev. 006, 03/1005) is **maintained**.

Applicant Claims

Applicant claims an emulsifiable concentrate comprising an active ingredient being a dinitroaniline compound, emulsifier or emulsifier mixture, a solvent, and a cosolvent having the following formula $R_1O-CO-(CH_2)_n-CO-OR_2$.

Determination of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art (MPEP §2141.01)

Aven teaches "Crop protection emulsifiable concentrate containing defoaming agents" (See title). "Emulsifiable concentrate (EC) formulations conventionally contain an active ingredient, one or more surfactants which act as emulsifiers upon dilution of the EC with water, and a water immiscible solvent. Typical solvents for conventional EC formulations are aromatic hydrocarbons such as xylene, Shellsol A or Solvesso 200." (See page 2, paragraph 0001). "The relative amount of solid active ingredient soluble in EC increases by about 40 to 60% when 10 to 15% cosolvent is incorporated into the formulation." (See page 8, paragraph 0062). "It has surprisingly been found that the stable EC formulations containing at least one pesticidal crop protection active compound, at least one non polar organic solvent, optionally one polar aprotic cosolvent, an emulsifiable surfactant system, and at least one defoaming and foam breaking agent ... show clearly reduced foaming behavior upon dilution with water." (See page 3, paragraph 0015). "Preferably, the pesticide is selected from the group consisting of herbicides, insecticides, fungicides, bactericides, nematocides, algicides, molluscicides, virucides, compounds inducing resistance into plants, biological control agents such as viruses, bacteria, nematodes, fungi and other microorganisms, repellents of birds and animals, and plant growth regulators, or mixtures thereof." (See page 3, paragraph 0018). "Preferred herbicides are the compounds selected from the group consisting of: pendimethalin and trifluralin". (See page 4, paragraphs 0027 and 0028). "The suitable organic solvents in which the pesticide is dissolved are, as a rule, water-immiscible solvents. They are preferably selected from the group consisting of aromatic hydrocarbons, aliphatic hydrocarbons, carboxylic acid esters, alcohols,

dialkylene glycol mono- or dialkyl ethers and esters of plant oils or mixtures thereof" (See page 5, paragraph 0034). "The water-miscible aprotic solvents used as cosolvents are useful to increase the amount of active ingredient and adjuvant in the EC." (See page 3, paragraph 0038). "In another preferred embodiment of the invention the cosolvent consists essentially of one or more, preferably two or three dimethyl dicarboxylates of formula $H_3CO-CO-(CH_2)_n-CO-OCH_3$ wherein n is 2, 3, or 4. A particularly preferred cosolvent is a mixture consisting of glutaric acid dimethyl ester, succinic acid dimethyl ester, and adipic acid dimethyl ester, most preferred DBE ..." (See page 3, paragraph 0039 and 0040). "The emulsifying surfactant system enabling the EC to form an oil-in-water emulsion when the formulation is added to water is a mixture of two or more surfactants, at least one of which is an anionic surfactant (a) and at least one of which is a nonionic surfactant (b). (See page 5, paragraph 0041). "Most preferred anionic surfactants are the sodium, calcium or triethyl ammonium salts of dodecyl benzene sulfonic acid ..." (See page 6, paragraph 0042). "Examples of non-ionic surfactants are nonylphenol polyethoxy ethanols, castor oil polyglycol ethers, polyadducts of ethylene oxide and propylene oxide, tributyl phenoxy polyethoxy ethanol, octyl phenoxy polyethoxy ethanol and tristyrilphenol ethoxylates ... Preferred are ethoxylated fatty acids such as castor or canola oil ethoxylates ... such as ... UKanil®2507(castor oil ethoxylate) ..." (See page 6, paragraphs 0043 and 0044). "Preferred embodiments of the invention are as follows: (i) An EC containing – 10 to 900 g/L, in particular, 100 to 850 g/L of at least one pesticidal crop protection active compound, - 50 to 800 g/L, in particular, 100 to 300 g/L of at least one non-polar organic

solvent, -0 to 400 g/L, in particular, 0 to 250 g/L of at least one polar aprotic cosolvent, -20 to 500 g/L, in particular, 40 to 450 g/L of the emulsifying surfactant system, and -0.1 to 20 g/L, in particular 0.2 to 10 g/L of at least one defoaming or foam breaking agent ...” (See page 7, paragraph 0058). In preferred example an EC formulation is prepared containing: 240 g/L Pendimethalin, 50 g/L Phenylsulfonat CA100, 50 g/L Ukanil 2507, 264 g/L Synperonic 91-6, 198 g/L DBE, 1 g/L Fluowet PP, and to 1L Agsol EX12. (See page 14, example 10). Phenylsulfant CA 100 is a mixture of calcium salt of branched dodecyl benzene sulfonate, Genopol X-060, and Solvesso 200. (See page 9, paragraph 0069). For the foregoing reasons the instant emulsifiable concentrate is anticipated.

***Ascertainment of the Difference Between Scope the Prior Art and the Claims
(MPEP §2141.012)***

Aven does not teach the co-solvent being a diisobutyl adipate or a mixture of diisobutyl adipate, diisobutyl glutarate, and diisobutyl succinate. This deficiency is cured by the teachings of Hei et al.

Hei et al. teaches an antimicrobial composition comprising a diluting solvent (water), an antimicrobially-active solvent, an optional cosolvent, surfactant, or additional antimicrobial surfactant. (See abstract). The preferred solvents include dibasic esters such as DBE and DBE-IB. (See column 7, Lines 1-27). The composition is suitable for application to growing or harvested plant material including leaves, stems, tubers, roots, seeds, and the like. (See column 12, Lines 13-15).

Sealed Air teaches that DBE-IB is composition comprising 55-70% Diisobutyl glutarate, 20-30% Diisobutyl succinate, and 10-20% Diisobutyl adipate. (See page 1, Section 2).

***Finding of Prima Facie Obviousness Rational and Motivation
(MPEP §2142-2143)***

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Aven with Hei et al. One would have been motivated to do so because Hei et al. teaches that a composition useful for plant protection wherein the solvents DBE and DBE-IB are suitable alternatives for each other. Therefore, the instant emulsifiable concentrate would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

Applicant argues that the combined teachings of Aven and Hei et al. do not make obvious instant composition, because applicants have found unexpectedly that the instant composition exhibit reduced crystallization. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but found not to be persuasive. Applicant has only shown that the addition of a co-solvent having the following formula $R_1O-CO-(CH_2)_n-CO-OR_2$ would reduce crystallization. Since, both DBE and DBE-IB both fall under the aforementioned co-solvent formula it would be expected that either one would result in reduced crystallization. Therefore, the rejection of claims 15, 16, and 18-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is maintained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ali Soroush whose telephone number is (571) 272-9925. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:30am to 5:00pm E.S.T.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on (571) 272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ali Soroush
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 1616

/Mina Haghighatian/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1616